

CASE NO.: STL9-2000-0037-US1
Serial No.: 09/922,201
February 17, 2005
Page 8


PROPOSED PATENT
Filed August 2, 2001

Remarks

Independent Claims 1, 11, 22, and 30 now respectively recite limitations of now-cancelled dependent Claims 5, 15, 25, and 31, which limitations have been rejected based on the allegation that ~~they~~ are taught in Rakavy et al., col. 7, lines 42-62 and col. 9, lines 15-50. In fact, the rejected limitations do not appear anywhere in the cited sections. This will be the issue on appeal, along with the Section 101 rejections. Should the anticipation rejections be persisted in, SPE involvement and concurrence in any Advisory Action that might be sent is requested, to avoid churning prosecution by reopening after the obvious flaws in the rejections are revealed during the Appeal Conference.

The Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at (619) 338-8075 for any reason which would advance the instant application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



John L. Rogitz
Registration No. 33,549
Attorney of Record
750 B Street, Suite 3120
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1176-5.AM3